

## THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL SPRING INSTITUTE OF FES

### Social work in the face of open cooperation and closed cooperation: theoretical issues and practical perspectives

Kingdom of Morocco - University Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah Fes - Faculty of Arts and Humanities Fes Sais  
In collaboration with : The School of Social Work at the University of Moncton (Canada)

From May 10th to May 16th 2010 - Fes



[hichamcogn\\_99@yahoo.fr](mailto:hichamcogn_99@yahoo.fr)

Following the tremendous success of the last two annual meetings held in 2008 and 2009, the Faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines de l'Université Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah (Maroc) and the École de travail social de l'Université de Moncton (Canada) are proud to coorganise the Second edition of the International Spring institute of Fès. This Spring institute aims to make different participants (professors, students, practitioners, community leaders, etc.) meet together in order to share their researches around the stakes related to the links between theoretical and practical issues, which are central to anthropology, sociology and social work. Specifically, this 2010 Spring institute will foster on open cooperation and closed cooperation in order to make participants discuss around their experiences in different academic perspectives, such as: teaching, research, practical and field work.

The purpose of this Second International Spring institute organised by the Filière d'assistance sociale de la Faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines Fès Sais and the École de travail social de Moncton is two-fold: i) explore theoretical debates on interindividual cooperation ii) present specific case studies which are related to those theoretical debates and that are relevant for social work.

We would like to invite you to participate to the activities which will be held between May 10<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>, in Fès (Morocco), as participant or speaker (see Call for paper document). In both cases, you must register by filling the registration form (see Registration form for the Second International Spring Institute of Fès - May 10th to 16th 2010) and send it, with your registration check, before April 1<sup>st</sup> 2010.

#### Main themes of the Second Spring Institute

Thème 1 : Cooperation with Marginalized Groups

Thème 2: Open cooperation, its role in State structural decision making process

Thème 3: Social work and professional identity

Thème 4: Providing and evaluating services

Thème 5: Social Work in the Context of Religious and Cultural Plurality

Thème 6 : Social work and gender

#### Rational of the Second International Spring Institute of Fès

##### 1. Cooperation, a social truth for humans

A consensus exists among scientists that cooperation, which consists of several people doing something together

while having a common goal in mind<sup>1</sup> is one of the traits that describes the identity of *Homo sapiens*.<sup>2</sup> Seen in certain animals, for example capuchin monkeys<sup>3</sup> or red colobus monkeys and monkeys of Diana<sup>4</sup>, undoubtedly very ancient among hominids<sup>4</sup>, this social fact has a particular form among humans. Endowed with a capability of cooperation immensely superior than other animals, human beings, notes John Searle<sup>5</sup>, possess a natural ability to engage in cooperative behaviour. Children, as early as only a few months of age, are predisposed to mutual attention<sup>6</sup>, which is a minimum form of sociality due to the fragility of the species, which then evolves towards more complex forms. Humans are the only species in which we can observe strong, regular, diverse, risky<sup>7</sup>, vast and sometimes costly cooperation between individuals who aren't related<sup>9</sup>. The more complex forms of cooperation are made possible by humans' language abilities, *Homo sapiens* being able to manage very large networks of reciprocity<sup>10</sup>. This idea is not a new one. It is found through the works of Cabanis<sup>11</sup> or even Darwin, where, in *The Descent of Man*<sup>12</sup>, he underlines the social qualities of *Homo sapiens*, which have led them to help fellow man and to receive help in return. Is it not also reasonable to see cooperation as the greatest social truth for humans? It is one of the conditions of emergence of forms of sharing; that is, collective ways of being, of doing, of thinking, of feeling. It is the offering here, that is expressed as a condition of the social bond<sup>13</sup>.

If, in an evolutionary perspective, cooperation can be presented as an enigma – wouldn't the adaptive advantage of an individual be one of being egotistical or a *free-rider*, notably in a world of cooperative humans? - It is because another characteristic of *Homo sapiens* wasn't sufficiently taken into account: its deeply cultural nature<sup>14</sup>. At each moment of human existence, the intelligibility of the sensitive, the access to rationality, the explanation of what seems unexplainable – for example, the repetition of misfortune<sup>15</sup> or contradictions impossible to overcome<sup>16</sup> – are only made possible through sharing of practices, of information<sup>17</sup>, of representations that will allow members of a group to get answers where man alone could not. Therefore, human cooperation derives from explanations inextricably evolutionary and cultural in nature<sup>17</sup>.

A more concrete example of this, in the field of social action, is that cooperation as a form of sharing can be presented as follows: the feeling of powerlessness and failure appears and is further developed when the social worker feels that he is confronted, alone, to difficulties and obstacles that are insurmountable. He then begins to underestimate his capabilities and means to overcome them. Open

cooperation, which can be seen in the networking of several social actors, allows a certain synergy of skills, optimizing social action from the social worker and reducing his feeling of isolation.

## 2. Closed cooperation, open cooperation and decision-making

The biggest human problem, according to Auguste Comte<sup>18</sup>, is to subordinate selfishness to altruism. In fact, describing man by his egotistical nature is very reducing. It is probably impossible for a human being to be solely interested in himself, without cooperating at one moment or another of his existence, with at least his immediate surroundings<sup>19</sup>. However, this cooperation can be made under two opposite forms: a corporatist cooperation, restricted towards a particular group (family, community, ethnic group, nation, etc.) and a cooperation that surpasses the limits of this group. We will call the first form "closed cooperation" and the second form "open cooperation", with reference, of course, to the bergsonian and popperian distinction between closed and open societies<sup>20</sup>.

Some may wonder how members of a group will choose one or other form of cooperation. These choices remain, to follow along the lines of Lévinas' writings<sup>21</sup>, in the universe of non intentional<sup>22</sup> consciousness<sup>23</sup>, and remain, in variable proportions, under the hold of a deliberative system and an emotional system<sup>24</sup>, and appear in social environments in which other individuals influence directly or indirectly<sup>25</sup>, individual decisions<sup>26</sup>.

Social sciences, and anthropology in particular, because of its empirical tradition that leads it to work closely with an undetermined amount of decisions that individuals face in their daily lives, must understand these theoretical and political questions.

The question is whether we can determine if, with absolute certainty, identity strategies will inevitably prevail on cooperative behaviour, confining it to closeness, or if the identity strategies, in certain decision making, can become subordinate to cooperative behaviour<sup>27</sup>, therefore paving the way to a more open society.

In the field of social work, the issues of closed cooperation, open cooperation and decision-making can be explained by the fact that the social worker, whose mandate is to reduce negative effects of certain social issues, must answer to a number of obligations defined by the institution with whom he is employed. Can we therefore consider this action as a form of open cooperation even if it is predefined by the institution in which it takes place?

It is clear that open cooperation is a committed process that is interested in closely understanding the different aspects of society, whether it be in terms of identity (native, women, religious or ethnic group...), in terms of age (childhood, old age, etc.), or of being part of a vulnerable group (handicap, poverty, illiteracy, etc.) The social actor is therefore invited to observe, prior to action, the mental, emotional, and spiritual state of others; know their expectations; search the source of their problems. This having been said, the social actor's profile demands flexibility in "perspective taking" in order to understand how others see the world around them<sup>28</sup>.

In this view, instead of imposing predetermined projects or giving miracle advice, the social worker's role is to encourage people to discover their own solutions, to mount their own projects, to develop self-initiative<sup>29</sup>. It is finally, a role of mediator that must be performed by the social worker in order to encourage forms of open cooperation, regardless of the population being served.

If theoretically this role seems obvious, it raises many practical issues. Of course the social worker must be "open and flexible", but this only works if the people with whom he is working are willing to dialog with him. Hence, the social worker must create a relationship of trust with the people with whom he is intervening; openness to cooperation must therefore be mutual. This openness can only be possible through a "perspective taking" process, dialogue which is based on a series of adjustments that are fundamental to the creation of a therapeutic alliance.

## 3. Case study

Many case studies can be presented, for example, in the field of regional development<sup>30</sup>, of social work, of treatment of disabilities, of ecology, of micro-economy, of nutrition practices, of *racial thinking*, of religious practices<sup>31</sup> etc., which could just as well be suggested by practitioners (e.g. social workers, social development lobbyists), than by theorists of social sciences (anthropology, sociology, economy). These cases will allow for exploration on how government institutions and their employees can have an open dialogue, through different cooperative initiatives, and also address the capacity and willingness of certain vulnerable populations to collaborate to this dialogue.

### Scientific committee

- Pr. Brahim Akdim, (Doyen de la faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines Saïs Fès, professeur d'enseignement supérieur), President of the scientific committee
- Pr. Charles Gaucher (Travail social : Canada)
- Pr. Roger Smith (Social work: England)
- Pr. Ian Shaw (Social work: England)
- Pr. Ali Watfa (Psychologie Social: Syrie)
- Pr. Jamel Trukey (Psychologie Clinique : Tunisie)
- Pr. Joël Candau (Anthropologie des religions : France)
- Pr. Khabbache Hicham (Professeur de sociologie cognitive: Saïs Fès)
- Pr. Mohamed Ababou (Professeur de Sociologie des religions et de santé : Dhar almhras Fès)

### Organizational committee

- Pr. Charles Gaucher (Professeur de travail social : Canada)
- Mme Stephanie Tardif (Organisatrice communautaire : Canada)
- Pr. Khabbache Hicham (Professeur de sociologie cognitive: Saïs Fès)
- Pr. Abdellah hallou, (Professeur de psychologie, CPR, Fès)

- Pr. Mohamed Dokkar, (Professeur de psychologie : Centre de formation des instituteurs, Fès)
- Pr. Abdelmajid Makni, (Coordinateur de l'agence de développement social, région Fès)
- M. Mohamed Atiche (Ingénieur de programmation, Président de l'association AMJD)
- M. Jebbar Abdelhak (Doctorant en Anthropologie des religions; Département d'anglais)
- M. Najah Mahmi (Doctorant en Anthropologie des religions; Département d'anglais)

#### Guest speakers

- Pr. Charles Gaucher (Professeur de travail social : Canada)
- Pr. Mikko Juhani Mäntyssari (Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences University of Jyväskylä : Finland)
- Pr. Ali Watfa (Psychologie Social: Syrie)
- Pr. Jamel Trukey (Psychologie Clinique : Tunisie)
- Pr. Roger Smith (Professeur de travail social: England)
- Pr. Ian Shaw (Professeur de travail social : England)
- Pr. Joël Candau (Professeur d'anthropologie : France)
- Pr. Roger Smith (Social work: England)
- Pr. Ian Shaw (Social work: England)
- Pr. Haluk Soydan (Director, Hamovitch Center for Science in the Human Services : Sued)
- Pr. Natalie Bolzan (Social Work and Community Welfare : Australie)
- Pr. Susan Dawson (Social Work : USA)
- Pr. Gary Madsen (sociologie des religions : USA)

#### Call for papers

You may submit two types of papers to the scientific committee:

- **Papers** are of standard format and are reserved for the scientific community in order to present a 30 minutes conference between May 10 and 16.
- **Posters** are of shorter length and are more open to scientific contributions in the making (research problematic, provisional results, commencement of thesis, etc.), to case studies, to presentations of experiences, to points of view or personal reflections, to institutional presentations. Posters are therefore open to a larger public, doctoral holders, students, social actors, etc. and must be presented between May 10 and 16 in Fès in a not more bigger format than 100 cm by 200 cm.

#### Submission of summaries

Participants wishing to present a **paper** (scientific paper) will need to provide a **two page detailed summary** with research problematic, methodology or approach, main results and bibliography.

Participants wishing to present a **poster** ( research problematic, provisional results, commencement of thesis, case studies, presentations of experiences, personal reflections, institutional presentations) will need to provide a **one page summary**.

Summaries should be sent to the following address: [hichamcogn\\_99@yahoo.fr](mailto:hichamcogn_99@yahoo.fr) and will be evaluated by the members of the scientific committee.

Submission deadline: December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2009

Notice of decision following scientific evaluation: January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010

For registration, please fill out annexed form and send it, prior to April 1<sup>st</sup>, to Pr. Charles Gaucher at the following address:

Charles Gaucher: Professeur adjoint- École de travail social - Université de Moncton - Pavillon Léopold-Taillon, local 366 - N-B, Canada, E1A 3E9

| Evaluation contents  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | X |
| The proposition contributes to the advancement of knowledge on one of the theme of the Fès Spring institute 2010 related to the notions of open and close cooperation.   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The proposition will interest the Spring institute participants.   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The <b>research question</b> or problem is clearly identified and its choice has been supported by a literature review in the field                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The proposed <b>method</b> is rigorous and is adapted to the research problem. Its different aspects are described (sample, data-collection instruments, analysis, etc.) |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The <b>results</b> are clearly presented and are in relation with the themes of the Spring institute.  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The <b>discussion</b> is sufficiently deep and extensive, while in keeping with the rationale of the problem.  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The proposition will clearly benefit the researches interested in the notions of open and close cooperation  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The proposition relies on the recent contributions in the field.   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

- <sup>1</sup> Conein, C., 2005, Les sens sociaux. Trois essais de sociologie cognitive, Paris, Economica, p. VIII.
- <sup>2</sup> Brosnan, S., de Waal, F., 2003, "Monkeys Reject Unequal Pay", *Nature*, 425 : 297-299.
- <sup>3</sup> Boyd, R., Silk, J., 2004, *L'aventure humaine. Des molécules à la culture*, Bruxelles, Éd. De Boeck Université, p. 161.
- <sup>4</sup> Lordkipanidze, David & al., 2005, "The earliest toothless hominin skull", *Nature*, 434 : 717-718.
- <sup>5</sup> Searle, J., 2000, « L'ontologie de la réalité sociale », *Raisons pratiques*, Paris, EHESS, p. 199.
- <sup>6</sup> Conein, C., 2005, Les sens sociaux. Trois essais de sociologie cognitive, Paris, Economica.
- <sup>7</sup> Axelrod, R., 1992, *Donnant donnant. Théorie du comportement coopératif*, Paris, Odile Jacob; Kappeler, P. M., Van Schaik, C. P. (éd.), 2006, *Cooperation in Primates and Humans. Mechanisms and Evolution*, Berlin, Springer.
- <sup>8</sup> The cost of the sanction for lack of cooperation can exceed the immediate gain of cooperation.
- <sup>9</sup> Richerson, P. J., Boyd, R., 2005, *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, p. 244.
- <sup>10</sup> Boyd, R., Richerson, P. J., 2006, « Solving the Puzzle of Human Cooperation » in Levinson, S. C, Jaisson, P. (éd.), *Evolution and Culture*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press, p. 105-132.
- <sup>11</sup> Moral sympathy consists in the ability to share the ideas and affections of others; in the hopes of sharing our own ideas and affections Cabanis, P.J.G., 1980 (éd. de 1844), *Rapports du physique et du moral de l'homme*, Genève, Slatkine Reprints, p. 549.
- <sup>12</sup> Darwin, C., 2000 (1871), *La filiation de l'homme et la sélection liée au sexe*, Paris, Éditions Syllepse, 2000, p. 148.
- <sup>13</sup> Mauss, M., 1923-1924, « Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques », *Année sociologique*, tome I, 2 : 30-186.
- <sup>14</sup> Candau, J., 2009, « H2s = N<sup>2</sup> » in Sébastien Baud, Nancy Midol (éd.), *La conscience dans tous ses états*, Paris, Elsevier Masson, p. 15-31.
- <sup>15</sup> Douglas, M., 1992, *De la souillure. Études sur la notion de pollution et de tabou*, Paris, La Découverte ; Favret-Saada, J., 1977, *Les mots, la mort, les sorts. La sorcellerie dans le Bocage*, Paris, Gallimard, 1977.
- <sup>16</sup> Lévi-Strauss, C., 1971, *Mythologiques \*\*\*\* L'homme nu*, Paris, Plon, p. 562.
- <sup>17</sup> Danchin, E., Giraldeau, L.-A., Valone, T.J., Wagner, R.H., 2004, « Public Information: From Nosy Neighbors to Cultural Evolution », *Science*, 305 : 487-491.
- <sup>18</sup> Henrich, J., Henrich, N., 2007, *Why Humans Cooperate: A Cultural and Evolutionary Explanation*, Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press.
- <sup>19</sup> Comte, A., 1852, *Catéchisme positiviste*, Paris, chez l'auteur, p. 82.
- <sup>20</sup> Henrich, J., Henrich, N., 2007, *Why Humans Cooperate: A Cultural and Evolutionary Explanation*, Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press.
- <sup>21</sup> Candau, J., 2009, « H2s = N<sup>2</sup> » in Sébastien Baud, Nancy Midol (éd.), *La conscience dans tous ses états*, Paris, Elsevier Masson, p. 15-31.
- <sup>22</sup> Lévinas, E., 1991, *Entre nous. Essai sur le penser-à-l'autre*. Paris, Grasset & Fasquelle.
- <sup>23</sup> The choice need only be self-initiated and adaptive. (Heisenberg, M., 2009, « Is free will an illusion? », *Nature*, 459 : 164-165.)
- <sup>24</sup> Galdi, S., Arcuri, L., Gawronski, B., 2008, « Automatic Mental Associations Predict Future Choices of Undecided Decision-Makers », *Science*, 321 : 1100-1102. ; Pessiglione, M., Petrovic, P., Daunizeau, J., Palminteri, S., Dolan, R.J., Frith, C.D., 2008, « Subliminal Instrumental Conditioning Demonstrated in the Human Brain », *Neuron*, 59 : 561-567. ; Soon, C., Brass, M., Heinze, H.J., Haynes, J.D., 2008, « Unconscious determinants of free decisions in the human brain », *Nature Neuroscience*, 11(5) : 543-545. ; Wilson, T.D., Bar-Anan, Y., 2008, « The Unseen Mind », *Science*, 321 : 1046-1047.
- <sup>25</sup> Cabanac, M., Bonniot-Cabanac, M.C., 2007, « Decision making: rational or hedonic? », *Behavioral and Brain Functions*, 3 : 45, doi:10.1186/1744-9081-3-45. ; Kepecs, A., Uchida, N., Zariwala, H.A., Mainen, Z.F., 2008, « Neural correlates, computation and behavioural impact of decision confidence », *Nature*, 455, 2008 : 227-231. ; Kuo, W.J., Sjöström, T., Chen, Y.P., Wang, Y.H., Huang, C.Y., 2009, « Intuition and Deliberation: Two Systems for Strategizing in the Brain », *Science*, 324 : 519-522. ; Rustichini, A., 2005, « Emotion and Reason in Making Decisions », *Science*, 310 : 1624-1625. ; Sanfey, A.G., Loewenstein, G., McClure, S.M., Cohen, J.D., 2006, « Neuroeconomics: cross-currents in research on decision-making », *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(3) : 108-116. ; Sharot, T., De Martino, B., Dolan, R.J., 2009, « How Choice Reveals and Shapes Expected Hedonic Outcome », *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 29(12) : 3760-3765. ; Tom, S.M., Fox, C.R., Trepel, C., Poldrack, R.A., 2007, « The Neural Basis of Loss Aversion in Decision-Making Under Risk », *Science*, 315 : 515-518.

<sup>26</sup> Denrell, J., 2008, « Indirect Social Influence », *Science*, 321 : 47-48.

<sup>27</sup> Biele, G., Rieskamp, Gonzalez, J.R., 2009, « Computational Models for the Combination of Advice and Individual Learning », *Cognitive Science*, 33 : 206-242. ; Kitayama, S., Snibbe, A.C., Markus, H.R., Suzuki, T., 2004, « Is There Any 'Free' Choice? Self and Dissonance in Two Cultures », *Psychological Science*, 15(8) : 527-533. ; Lee, D., 2008, « Game theory and neural basis of social decision making », *Nature Neuroscience*, 11(4) : 404-409.

<sup>28</sup> Candau, J., 2005, *Anthropologie de la mémoire*, Paris, Armand Colin. ; Candau, J., 1998, *Mémoire et identité*, Paris, PUF.

<sup>29</sup> Vorauer, J. D., Martens, V., Sasaki S.J. (2009) [When Trying to Understand Detracts From Trying to Behave: Effects of Perspective Taking in Intergroup Interaction](#), *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Volume 96, Issue 4, Pages 811-827

<sup>30</sup> Khabbache, H. (2007). A View over Childhood by Bridging the Gap between Pluralistic Cognition and Education Sciences. *Journal of Arab Children (JAC)*

/Kuwait (Referred Academic Research Journal- Vol. 8- N° 32, Sep).

<sup>31</sup> A doctoral research is already in the making, under the direction of J. Candau in the industrial district of Biella (Italy, Piemonte), an area that is strongly encrusted in local community, territory and strong traditions, and is now experiencing a decisive turn, forcing it to undergo structural changes with regards to techniques and cooperation. The goal of the research is to understand how organizational innovations appear, by testing the hypothesis that social capital has a role in decision making, through alternatives of closed and open cooperation. Barlett, P. F., 1980, *Agricultural decision making, anthropological contributions to rural development*, New York, Academic Press

<sup>32</sup> Emphasis could be placed on this topic to converge (in part, for example, in a day or seminars) the *Spring Institute* program with the *Volubilis* program. In every religion there exists orthodox, even fundamentalist views, and others that are more liberal. The first seem to prefer closeness, the second openness. We can ask ourselves what decision process was utilized that lead people to side with one view or the other?

### Registration form for the Second International Spring Institute of Fès

May 10th to 16th 2010

\*Registration is obligatory for all participants and speakers

Name : .....

Address:.....

Email :.....

Phone number :.....

Payment :.....

\*Northern countries students : 100US\$ / Moroccan students or southern countries students : 30US\$

\* Northern countries speakers or participants : 200US\$

\* Moroccan or southern countries speakers or participants : 50US\$

\* Community leaders : 30US\$

\* Volunteers / guess speakers : 0US\$

Check \_\_\_\_\_ \$ Money order \_\_\_\_\_ \$

**Make the money order or check at the name of : École d'été Fès-2010**

Registration form and payment must be send at :

Charles Gaucher : Professeur adjoint

École de travail social - Université de Moncton

Pavillon Léopold-Taillon, local 366 -N-B, Canada, E1A 3E9

Some double (20€ or 25€) or single (33€) rooms are reserved for the Spring institute participants. Please let us know if you want us to keep one for you:

I would like to have a double room  I would like to have a single room